

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

---

AMY S. WHITEHEAD,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 5:05-CV-50

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL  
SECURITY,

HON. GORDON J. QUIST

Defendant.

---

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

The Court has before it Plaintiff's objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation issued on March 31, 2006. In his report and recommendation, the magistrate judge concluded that the Administrative Law Judge's (ALJ) determination that Plaintiff was not disabled because she could perform a significant range of sedentary work was supported by substantial evidence. In particular, the magistrate judge concluded that Plaintiff had waived any argument that the ALJ did not base his decision on the substantial evidence of the whole record in denying benefits and that the ALJ could properly discount Plaintiff's credibility based upon considerations such as Plaintiff's inconsistent information and statements regarding her drug history and educational history. The magistrate judge also found that the ALJ's hypothetical question to the vocational expert accurately set forth the limitations arising from Plaintiff's medical conditions and that the question to the vocational expert was proper. In addition, the magistrate judge concluded that there is no basis for the Court to review the Appeals Council's September 24, 2004, order denying Plaintiff's request for review of the ALJ's decision. Finally, the magistrate judge found that

Plaintiff had failed to develop and support her argument that the ALJ committed reversible error by discounting the testimony of Dr. Jerome.

After conducting a de novo review of the report and recommendation, the Court concludes that the report and recommendation should be adopted by the Court.

Plaintiff merely asks the Court to consider the prior arguments that Plaintiff submitted to the magistrate judge, without pointing out why the magistrate judge's conclusions are erroneous. Plaintiff does not even try to explain why the report and recommendation should be rejected, nor does she point to anything in the administrative record that undermines the magistrate judge's conclusions. It is well established that vague or general objections to a report and recommendation do not suffice; rather, they must be specific. *See Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995). Therefore,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation issued March 31, 2006 (docket no. 9), is **APPROVED AND ADOPTED** as the Opinion of this Court, and the decision of the Commissioner denying benefits to Plaintiff is **AFFIRMED**.

This case is **concluded**.

Dated: August 10, 2006

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/ Gordon J. Quist  
GORDON J. QUIST  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE